

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the present amendments prior to issuance of a first Office Action following the Request for Continued Examination filed on August 27, 2007.

Pursuant to this preliminary amendment, Claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-23 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 7 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 10-13, 15, 16 and 20 have been amended. Claims 21-23 are new and effectively replace canceled claims 1, 7 and 14, respectively.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks appearing below.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic Examiner Interview conducted on September 5, 2007, with the Examiner, attorney Morgan S. Heller II and the undersigned attorney, Michael J. Wasco, participating. During the interview the parties to the Interview discussed: 1) the differences between the subject matter of the current application and the subject matter of the Gregor et al. patent and other references considered by the Examiner; and 2) potential claim amendments that the Examiner may consider to make the claims patentable over the Gregor et al. patent and other references considered by the Examiner. A summary of the Interview on each of these topics immediately follows.

Differences between the Present Application and the Gregor et al. Patent

During the Interview it was agreed by all parties that there are indeed important differences between the subject matter described in the current application and the subject matter of the Gregor et al. patent and other references considered by the Examiner. Applicants pointed out that the device disclosed by the Gregor et al. patent would experience the problems addressed by the subject matter of the current application. Considering this, the Examiner acknowledged that a significant difference with the current application is that the Gregor et al. patent does not disclose a device that compensates for delay in a clock signal as between differing shift register latches (SRLs) on a common clock tree.

Claim Amendment

In view of the foregoing understanding of the parties to the Interview, the Examiner suggested during the Interview that he would consider an appropriate amendment to the

independent claims as being sufficient to overcome the anticipation rejection in view of Gregor et al., the obviousness rejection in view of a combination of Gregor et al. and Joordens et al., and other references considered during examination of the current application. Although the parties did not reach any definitive agreement on what such an appropriate amendment would be, the Examiner was receptive to Applicants' proposal that the claims be amended to reflect the delay compensation aspect more clearly. Accordingly, Applicants submitted a proposed new claim on September 5, 2007 to be reviewed by the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervising Primary Examiner (SPE). A copy of this submission is attached for convenience.

Acceptance of the Proposed New Claim

In a separate telephonic conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney Michael J. Wasco on September 7, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the Examiner's SPE considered the subject matter disclosed in the proposed new claim as being patentable over the Gregor et al. reference and the other references of record considered.

New Claims

As mentioned above, new claims 21-23 have been added to effectively replace original claims 1, 7 and 14, respectively. New claim 21, which replaces canceled original claim 1, is essentially the claim submitted for approval on September 5, 2007 (see the attachment), and subsequently approved by the Examiner and his SPE on September 7, 2007.

New claim 22 corresponds to original claim 7 (now canceled) and incorporates the subject matter of the approved proposed claim. New claim 23 corresponds to original claim 14 (now canceled) and incorporates the subject matter of the approved proposed claim. Because new claims 22 and 23 are highly parallel in subject matter to new claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable over the references of record for at least the same reasons as new claim 21 is allowable over these references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-23, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP.

By: 

Michael J. Wasco

Registration No.: 58,919

DOWNS RACHLIN MARTIN PLLC

Tel: (802) 863-2375

Attorneys for Assignee

Attachment:

Unofficial Communication submitted to the Examiner on September 5, 2007

2156632.2